

**REMARKS:**

Claims 29-33, 35-41, 43-49, 51, 52, and 54-56 are currently pending in the application.

Claims 1-28, 34, 42, 50 and 53 have been previously canceled, without *prejudice*.

The Specification stands objected to for various reasons.

Claims 29-33, 35, 36 and 54-56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Publication No. 2008/0126265 to Livesay et al. (hereinafter “*Livesay*”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,406,436 to Reisman et al. (hereinafter “*Reisman*”) as supported in U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/278,033 to *Reisman* (hereinafter “*Reisman Provisional*”) in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,406,436 to Elad et al. (hereinafter “*Elad*”).

Claims 37-41, 43-49 and 51-52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Reisman* in view of *Elad*.

Initially Applicants note that there appears to be various typographical errors in the subject Office Action. Specifically, it is unclear as to what prior art the Examiner is asserting against Applicant’s claims and what claims contain allowable subject matter as already acknowledged by the Examiner. In the Office Action of March 24, 2010, the Examiner properly cited U.S. Publication No. 2007/0081197 to Omoigui et al., however, in the next Office Action of September 7, 2010, the Examiner withdrew the previous rejections of Applicant’s claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the *Omoigui* reference.

Specifically the Examiner acknowledged allowable subject matter in the Office Action of September 7, 2010:

***Allowable Subject Matter***

6. Claims 31 and 34 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 39 and 42 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 47 and 50 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 54 will allowable once the below mentioned 35 USC 101 rejection is resolved.

Claim 55 allowable because the prior arts do not disclose the claimed limitation combination.

Claim 56 will allowable once the below mentioned 35 USC 101 rejection is resolved.

Furthermore, the Examiner again acknowledged allowable subject matter in the Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary of August 19, 2010:

Examiner contacted Applicant and indicated that claims 54-56 are allowable and indicated allowable subject matter for claims 29, 37 and 45 by objecting to their corresponding dependent (31, 34, 39, 42, 47 and 50) but Applicant refused the proposal and request an office action indicating a prior art rejection of independent claims 29, 37 and 45.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests clarification from the Examiner, as to the acknowledged Allowable Subject Matter of Applicant's claims and clarification of the prior art currently asserted against Applicant's claims.

Applicant further notes with thanks the Examiner's response of February 15, 2011. Applicant still further notes with thanks the Examiner's withdrawal of the previous rejections of Claims 29-36, 45-52, 54, and 56 under U.S.C. § 101.

Applicant yet further notes with thanks, the Examiner's mapping of the specification of the *Reisman* patent with the *Reisman Provisional* specification. However, Applicants believes, however, that the Applicant will be able to satisfy the requirements of 37 C.F.R § 131 by filing a declaration showing a completion of the present invention prior to the filing of the *Reisman Provisional*, and respectfully reserve Applicant's right to do so in the future during the pendency of the subject Application. Applicant also believes, however, that the present invention is not disclosed or fairly suggested by the *Reisman Provisional*, and therefore, traverses the rejection of Claims 29-52 and 54-56 for at least the reasons recited below.

Applicant respectfully submits that all of Applicant's arguments are without *prejudice* or *disclaimer*. In addition, Applicant has merely discussed example distinctions from the cited prior art. Other distinctions may exist, and as such, Applicant reserves the right to discuss these additional distinctions in a future Response or on Appeal, if appropriate. Applicant further respectfully submits that by not responding to additional statements made by the Examiner, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Examiner's additional statements. The example distinctions discussed by Applicant are considered sufficient to overcome the Examiner's rejections.

**I. Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant notes with thanks the Examiner statement in the Office Action of September 7, 2010 and the Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary of August 19, 2010 that Claims 31, 39, 47 and 54-56 contain allowable subject matter. However, as noted above, Applicant respectfully requests clarification from the Examiner to any inadvertent typographical errors in the subject Office Action.

**II. Objection to the Specification**

The specification stands object to for various reasons. Specifically the Examiner states:

The specification is object to because it lacks antecedent basis for claimed computer readable medium.

(February 15, 2011 Office Action, page 3).

Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention, for example, to page 6, lines 18-27 of the specification of the subject application, as filed, which provides support for a "computer system." Applicant respectfully submits that one skilled in the art readily recognizes a "computer-readable medium" to be inherent in a "computer system." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

### **III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 29-30, 32-33, and 35-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Livesay* in view of *Reisman* and *Elad*. Claims 37-38, 40-41, 43-46, 48-49, and 51-52 stand rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Reisman* in view of *Elad*. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 29-30, 32-33, 35-36, 37-38, 40-41, 43-46, 48-49, and 51-52 are not disclosed by *Livesay*, *Reisman* and *Elad*, whether taken individually or in combination. Thus, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's obviousness rejection of Claims 29-30, 32-33, 35-36, 37-38, 40-41, 43-46, 48-49, and 51-52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the proposed combination of *Livesay*, *Reisman* and *Elad*., whether taken individually or in combination.

As noted above, Applicant respectfully requests clarification from the Examiner, as to the acknowledged Allowable Subject Matter of Applicant's claims and clarification of the prior art currently asserted against Applicant's claims. Furthermore, Applicant thanks the Examiner for noting that Claims 31, 34, 39, 42, 47, 50, and 54-56 contain allowable subject matter. (September 7, 2010 Office Action, page 3). In addition, Applicant will not discuss the *Omoigui* reference in this response, as this appears to be a typographical error, appropriate correction is respectfully requested.

In rejecting Applicant's claims, the Examiner states the following:

Livesay does not go into detail regarding the hierarchy of product within the schemas, however in an analogous art of data mapping/translating, Reisman teaches:

the source schema data and target schema data each comprising a taxonomy comprising a hierarchy of classes into which products are categorized wherein the target schema comprises a different taxonomy then the taxonomy of the source schema (Column 25, lines 48-65, wherein the XML files contain different item structure taxonomy)(page 49, lines 5-16 in the provisional application 60/278033)

at least the source schema further comprising a product ontology associated with one or more of the classes, each product ontology comprising one or more product attributes (Column 25, lines 48-65 [according to the Examiner's mapping - page 49, lines 5-16 in the provisional application 60/278033], wherein the item attributes variation is the ontology criteria)

and associate one or more source classes of the source schema with one or more target classes of the target schema (Column 25, lines 48-65 [according to the Examiner's mapping - page 49, lines 5-16 in the provisional application 60/278033], wherein the item conversion / matching is the association of items (classes) within the XML file)

wherein at least one of the target classes is a parent class (Column 6, lines 14-23 [according to the Examiner's mapping - page 9, lines 19-23 and page 10, lines 1-4 in the provisional application 60/278033], wherein the class is the parent) and the product ontology for each target class is based on the product of the associated source classes[[.]] by determining an intersection of the product attributes included in the product of the target classes (column 6, lines 24-33 [according to the Examiner's mapping - page 9, lines 19-23 and page 10, lines 1-4 in the provisional application 60/278033], wherein the matching criteria is the product intersection)

(24 December 2009 Office Action, pages 6, 22, and 33). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertions and respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to page 9, lines 19-23 and page 10, lines 1-4 of the specification of the *Reisman Provisional*, provided below, on which the Examiner relies:

As used herein, the terms "post-sale market data" or "user-generated market data" or "consumer-generated market data" are meant to refer to one or both of "rating data" and "operational data." "Rating data" refers to a consumer-generated rating of an item, such as a product or a service. The rating is intended to be an indication of a consumer-perceived utility or usefulness of the item. A rating may be provided as a numerical scale with a predetermined range, i.e. 1 to 10, where 1 indicates a low level of utility and indicates a high level of utility. Other scales may be provided and used with the present invention, including scales having negative values. Ratings may also include component ratings that address specific aspects of overall utility, such as power, durability, appearance, and the like.

Applicant respectfully submits that *Reisman* fails to disclose at least ***"a storage medium stored therein an ontology generation module configured to generate a product ontology for each of the target classes, wherein at least one of the target classes is a parent class and the product ontology for each target class is based on the product ontologies of the associated source classes by determining an intersection of the product attributes included in the product ontologies of the target classes,"*** as required by Applicant's claims.

By contrast, as shown above, *Reisman* merely discloses, among other things, a rating which is intended to be an indication of a consumer-perceived utility or usefulness of the item. *Reisman* is silent and therefore, fails to disclose, ***"wherein at least one of the target classes is a parent class and the product ontology for each target class is based on the product ontologies of the associated source classes by determining an intersection of the product attributes included in the product ontologies of the target classes,"*** as required by Applicant's claims. Applicant respectfully submits

that merely stating that a rating is intended to be an indication of a consumer-perceived utility or usefulness of the item is not analogous to *determining an intersection of the product attributes included in the product ontologies of the target classes*.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and the claims of the subject application be allowed.

**IV. Office Action Fails to Properly Establish a *Prima Facie* case of Obviousness over the Proposed *Livesay-Reisman-Elad* Combination According to the UPSTO Examination Guidelines**

Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action fails to properly establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness based on the proposed combination of *Livesay*, *Reisman* and *Elad*, either individually or in combination, and in particular, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness based on the “Examination Guidelines for Determining Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. 103 in View of the Supreme Court Decision in *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*” (the “Guidelines”).

As reiterated by the Supreme Court in *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.* (*KSR*), the framework for the objective analysis for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 is stated in *Graham v. John Deere Co.* (383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966)). Obviousness is a question of law based on underlying factual inquiries. These factual inquiries enunciated by the Court are as follows:

- (1) Determining the scope and content of the prior art;
- (2) Ascertaining the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art; and
- (3) Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

(Notice, 72 Fed. Reg. 57527 (Oct. 10, 2007)). Objective evidence relevant to the issue of obviousness must be evaluated by Office personnel. (383 U.S. 17–18, 148 USPQ 467 (1966)). As stated by the Supreme Court in *KSR*, “While the sequence of these questions might be reordered in any particular case, the [*Graham*] factors continue to define the inquiry that controls.” (*KSR*, 550 U.S. at \_\_, 82 USPQ2d at 1391).

However, it is important to note that the Guidelines require that Office personnel “*ensure that the written record includes findings of fact concerning the state of the art and the teachings of the references applied.*” (Notice, 72 Fed. Reg. 57527 (Oct. 10, 2007)). In addition, the Guidelines remind Office personnel that the “*factual findings made by Office personnel are the necessary underpinnings to establish obviousness.*” (*id.*). Further, “*Office personnel must provide an explanation to support an obviousness rejection* under 35 U.S.C. 103. (*id.*). In fact, “35 U.S.C. 132 requires that the applicant be notified of the reasons for the rejection of the claim so that he or she can decide how best to proceed” and “clearly setting forth findings of fact and the rationale(s) to support a rejection in an Office action leads to the prompt resolution of issues pertinent to patentability.” (*id.*).

With respect to the subject application, the Office Action has not shown the *factual findings necessary to establish obviousness* or even *an explanation to support the obviousness rejection* based on the proposed combination of *Livesay, Reisman and Elad*. The Office Action merely states that “it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine *Livesay* and *Reisman* by incorporating the teaching of *Reisman* into the system of *Livesay*.” (February 15, 2011 Final Office Action, pages 4-5). Applicant respectfully disagrees and respectfully submits that the Examiner’s conclusory statement is not sufficient to establish the *factual findings necessary to establish obviousness* and is not a sufficient *explanation to support the obviousness rejection* based on the proposed combination of *Livesay, Reisman and Elad*. *Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide proper support for the obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 as necessitated by the Guidelines, including the factual findings necessary to establish obviousness to “ensure that the written record includes findings of fact concerning the state of the art and the teachings of the references applied.*” (Notice, 72 Fed. Reg. 57527 (Oct. 10, 2007)).

The Guidelines further provide guidance to Office personnel in “determining the scope and content of the prior art” such as, for example, “Office personnel must first obtain a thorough understanding of the invention disclosed and claimed in the application.” (Notice, 72 Fed. Reg. 57527 (Oct. 10, 2007)). The scope of the claimed invention must be clearly determined by giving the claims the “broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.” (*See Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1316, 75 USPQ2d 1321, 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2005) and MPEP § 2111.).

In addition, the Guidelines state that any “*obviousness rejection should include*, either explicitly or implicitly in view of the prior art applied, *an indication of the level of ordinary skill*.” (Notice, 72 Fed. Reg. 57528 (Oct. 10, 2007)). With respect to the subject Application, the Office Action has not provided *an indication of the level of ordinary skill*. *Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide proper support for the obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 as necessitated by the Guidelines, including an indication of the level of ordinary skill, relied upon by the Examiner.* (Notice, 72 Fed. Reg. 57527 (Oct. 10, 2007)).

The Guidelines still further provide that once the *Graham* factual inquiries are resolved, Office personnel must determine whether the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. (*Id.*). For example, the Guidelines state that *Office personnel must explain why the difference(s) between the prior art and the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.* (*Id.*). In addition, the Guidelines state that the proper analysis is *whether the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art after consideration of all the facts.* (*Id.* and *See* 35 U.S.C. 103(a)).

With respect to the subject Application, the Office Action has not expressly resolved any of the *Graham* factual inquiries to determine whether Applicant’s invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. In addition, the Office Action fails to *explain why the difference(s) between the proposed combination of Livesay, Reisman, Elad, and Applicant’s claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.* The Office Action merely states that one “having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the product categorization of Reisman into the system of Livesay for the purpose of leveraging XML schema when defining commerce or trade product in order to facilitate data exchange and parsing between partners.” (February 15, 2011 Final Office Action, pages 4-5). Applicant respectfully disagrees and further respectfully requests clarification as to how this statement *explains why the difference(s) between the proposed combination of Livesay, Reisman, Elad, and Applicant’s claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.* Applicant further respectfully submits that the Examiner is using the subject Application as a template to formulate reconstructive hindsight, which constitutes impermissible use of hindsight under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).



The Guidelines yet further state that the “key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is the *clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious.*” (Notice, 72 Fed. Reg. 57528 (Oct. 10, 2007)). In fact, the Supreme Court in *KSR* noted that “*the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be made explicit.*” (*id.*). The Court quoting *In re Kahn* (441 F.3d 977, 988, 78 USPQ2d 1329, 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2006)), stated that “[R]ejections on *obviousness cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements*; instead, there *must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.*” (*KSR*, 550 U.S. at \_\_\_, 82 USPQ2d at 1396). The Guidelines provide the following seven rationales:

- (A) Combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results;
- (B) Simple substitution of one known element for another to obtain predictable results;
- (C) Use of known technique to improve similar devices (methods, or products) in the same way;
- (D) Applying a known technique to a known device (method, or product) ready for improvement to yield predictable results;
- (E) “Obvious to try”—choosing from a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, with a reasonable expectation of success;
- (F) Known work in one field of endeavor may prompt variations of it for use in either the same field or a different one based on design incentives or other market forces if the variations would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art;
- (G) Some teaching, suggestion, or motivation in the prior art that would have led one of ordinary skill to modify the prior art reference or to combine prior art reference teachings to arrive at the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that the *Office Action fails to provide any articulation, let alone, clear articulation of the reasons why Applicant's claimed invention would have been obvious.* For example, the *Examiner has not adequately supported the selection and combination of Livesay, Reisman and Elad to render obvious Applicant's claimed invention.* The Examiner's unsupported conclusory statements that “it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Livesay and Reisman by incorporating the teaching of Reisman into the system of Livesay,” and “having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the product categorization of Reisman into the system of Livesay for the purpose of leveraging XML schema when defining commerce or trade product in order to facilitate data

exchange and parsing between partners,” *does not adequately provide clear articulation of the reasons why Applicant’s claimed invention would have been obvious*. (February 15, 2011 Final Office Action, pages 4-5). In addition, the Examiner’s unsupported conclusory statement fails to meet any of the Guidelines rationales to render obvious Applicant’s claimed invention.

Thus, if the Examiner continues to maintain the obviousness rejection based on the proposed combination of *Livesay*, *Reisman* and *Elad*, *Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide proper support for the obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 as necessitated by the Guidelines, including a statement by the Examiner identifying which one of the seven rationales the Examiner is relying on and the proper analysis of that particular rationale, as required by the Guidelines*.

**V. Applicant’s Claims are Patentable over the Proposed *Livesay-Reisman-Elad* Combination**

Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 29 is considered patentably distinguishable over the proposed combination of *Livesay*, *Reisman* and *Elad*. This being the case, Claims 37, 45, and 54-56 are also considered patentably distinguishable over the proposed combination of *Livesay*, *Reisman* and *Elad*, for at least the reasons discussed above in connection with Claim 29.

Dependent Claims 30-33, 35-36, 38-41, 43-44, and 46-49, 51-52 depend from Claims 29, 37, and 45, respectively. As mentioned above, each of Claims 29, 37, and 45 are considered patentably distinguishable over *Livesay*, *Reisman* and *Elad*. Thus, dependent Claims 30-33, 35-36, 38-41, 43-44, and 46-49, 51-52 are considered to be in condition for allowance for at least the reason of depending from an allowable claim.

Thus, for at least the reasons set forth herein, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 29-33, 35-41, 43-49, 51, 52, and 54-56 are not rendered obvious by the proposed combination of *Livesay*, *Reisman* and *Elad*. Applicant further respectfully submits that Claims 29-33, 35-41, 43-49, 51, 52, and 54-56 are in condition for allowance. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 29-33, 35-41, 43-49, 51, 52, and 54-56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn and that Claims 29-33, 35-41, 43-49, 51, 52, and 54-56 be allowed.

**CONCLUSION:**

In view of the foregoing remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and early reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Although Applicant believes no fees are deemed to be necessary; the undersigned hereby authorizes the Director to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayments, to **Deposit Account No. 500777**. If an extension of time is necessary for allowing this Response to be timely filed, this document is to be construed as also constituting a Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) to the extent necessary. Any fee required for such Petition for Extension of Time should be charged to **Deposit Account No. 500777**.

**Please link this application to Customer No. 53184 so that its status may be checked via the PAIR System.**

Respectfully submitted,

May 16, 2011

Date

/Steven J. Laureanti/signed

Steven J. Laureanti, Registration No. 50,274

BOOTH UDALL, PLC  
1155 W. Rio Salado Pkwy., Ste. 101  
Tempe AZ, 85281  
214.636.0799 (mobile)  
480.830.2700 (office)  
480.830.2717 (fax)  
steven@boothudall.com

**CUSTOMER NO. 53184**